UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/052,999	11/02/2001	Partha P. Tirumalai	SUN-P7133-RA	1267

22835	7590	11/04/2005

A. RICHARD PARK, REG. NO. 41241
PARK, VAUGHAN & FLEMING LLP
2820 FIFTH STREET
DAVIS, CA 95616

EXAMINER
FOWLKES, ANDRE R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2192	

DATE MAILED: 11/04/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>15 August 2005</u>.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-17</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-17</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is in response to the amendment filed 8/15/05.

2.   Claims 1-17 are currently pending.

Claim Objections

3.   The objection to claims 1, 8 and 13 has been withdrawn, in view of applicant's

amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that

form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5.   Claims 1-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by

Santhanam, U.S. Patent No. 5,704,053.

As per claim 1, Santhanam discloses **a method for generating code to**

perform anticipatory prefetching for data references, (col. 3:47-49, "The current

invention provides a new compiler for such a processor that facilitates efficient insertion

of explicit data prefetch instructions into loops within application programs"),

comprising:

- **receiving code to be executed on a computer system; analyzing the code to identify data references to be prefetched** (col. 3:50-51, "The compiler uses ... analysis (techniques) to determine data prefetching requirements"),

- **inserting prefetch instructions into a preceding basic block of the code in advance of the identified data references** (col. 3:51-53, "Analysis and explicit data cache prefetch instruction insertion are performed by the compiler", and prefetch instructions are always inserted into the code preceding the identified data reference to allow sufficient time for data to be prefetched),

- **wherein inserting prefetch instructions involves inserting multiple prefetch instructions for a given cache line** (col. 6:61-62, "the system is issuing a redundant (prefetch) instruction(s) to the memory system to retrieve the same cache line"),

- **wherein inserting the prefetch instructions involves:**

   - **attempting to calculate a stride value for a given data reference within a loop** (col. 6:3-5, "The compiler can predict (by attempting to calculate a stride value) which data (reference) is needed in advance for loops that access array elements in a regular fashion"),

   - **if the stride value cannot be calculated, setting the stride value to a default stride value** (col. 14:48-49, "(if the stride cant be calculated), then substitute some fixed constant, C"),

   - **inserting a prefetch instruction to prefetch the given data reference for a subsequent loop iteration based on the stride value** (col. 6:5-8, "The

compiler can then insert prefetch instructions into loops such that array elements

that are likely to be needed in future loop iterations are retrieved from memory

ahead of time").

- **wherein the stride value is constant for some (but not necessarily all) loop**

iterations (col. 2:25-28 ,"because the analysis is done at the source code level, it is

difficult to estimate the prefetch iteration distance (PFID) (in this situation the stride

value is constant for some but not necessarily all loop iterations), i.e. the PFID used is

always one loop iteration (i.e. default prefetch distance)").

As per claim 2, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Santhanam

discloses **allowing a system user to specify the default stride value** (col. 13:39,

"Estimating the average loop iteration latency").

As per claim 3, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Santhanam

discloses that **calculating the stride value involves:**

- **identifying an induction variable for the stride value** (col. 11:23, "Identify

simple basic loop induction variables"),

- **identifying a stride function for the stride value and calculating the stride**

value based upon the stride function and the induction variable (col. 17:54-60, "a

net loop increment of eight, and the element size of "A" is 8-bytes, this is a large stride

equivalence class, assuming a 32-byte cache line size (8.times.8 bytes=64 bytes)>32

bytes").

As per claim 4, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Santhanam

discloses that **inserting the prefetch instruction based on the stride value involves:**

- calculating a prefetch cover distance by dividing a cache line size by the

stride value (col. 15:64-67, "When the memory stride is <=cache line size, B(i) is

considered to be in the same cluster as B(i+1), and therefore omitted for prefetch

consideration (i.e. the prefetch cover distance is calculated based on the cache line size

and stride value)", and col. 17:54-66, "(Because the loop has) a net loop increment of

eight, and the element size of "A" is 8-bytes, this is a large stride equivalence class,

assuming a 32-byte cache line size (8.times.8 bytes=64 bytes)>32 bytes. All eight

references to " A" are placed into the same cluster because they exhibit group spatial

locality, and no group temporal locality. The cluster leader is the reference to A[i+7], and

the span of the cluster is 64-bytes (i.e. &A[i+7]-&A[i]). If the prefetch memory distance

was computed earlier to be 128-bytes, i.e. corresponding to a prefetch iteration distance

of two, it is only necessary to insert three prefetch instructions to account for the entire

span of this 8-member cluster.") ,

- calculating a prefetch ahead distance as a function of a prefetch latency,

the prefetch cover distance and an execution time of a loop (col. 7:11-18, "The

memory address is determined based on the number of loop iterations in advance (i.e.

the prefetch iteration distance or PFID) that data items need to be prefetched to fully

hide the time required to service potential data cache misses. The PFID is determined

taking into account the nature of the loop body instructions (i.e. execution time of the

loop and the prefetch cover distance) and characteristics of the target processor and

memory system (i.e. the prefetch latency and prefetch cover distance)"),

- calculating a prefetch address by multiplying the stride value by the

prefetch cover distance and the prefetch ahead distance and adding the result to

an address accessed by the given data reference (col. 7:11-18, "The memory

address is determined based on the number of loop iterations in advance (i.e. the

prefetch iteration distance or PFID) that data items need to be prefetched to fully hide

the time required to service potential data cache misses. The PFID is determined taking

into account the nature of the loop body instructions and characteristics of the target

processor and memory system.").

As per claim 5, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Santhanam

discloses that analyzing the code involves:

- identifying loop bodies within the code; identifying data references to be

prefetched from within the loop bodies (col. 8:30-35, "One important feature of the

invention identifies loops and access patterns to allow a determination of how many

cycles are devoted to loop iterations, and therefore allows insertion of the prefetch

instruction to a location of an array that is sufficiently far in advance to make sure that

the miss time is minimized.").

As per claim 6, the rejection of claim 5 is incorporated and further, Santhanam

discloses that analyzing the code to identify data references to be prefetched involves

examining a pattern of data references over multiple loop iterations (col. 14:6-10,

"Now, it is also necessary to address the issue of loops that have internal branches. The

minimum loop iteration latency for such loops is estimated by using previously collected

execution profile information, which indicates the execution count for each basic block in

the loop body.").

As per claim 7, the rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Santhanam

discloses that analyzing the code involves **analyzing the code within a compiler** (col.

3:47-49, "The current invention provides a new compiler for such a processor that

facilitates efficient insertion of explicit data prefetch instructions into loops within

application programs").

As per claims 8-12, this is a computer readable medium/product version of the

claimed method discussed above, in claims 1-7 , wherein all claimed limitations have

also been addressed and/or cited as set forth above. For example, see Santhanam's

"new compiler" (col. 3:47-49).

As per claims 13-17, this is an apparatus version of the claimed method

discussed above, in claims 1-7 , wherein all claimed limitations have also been

addressed and/or cited as set forth above. For example, see Santhanam Fig. 1

computer architecture, item 10 and associated text.

Response to Arguments

6.   Applicants arguments have been considered but they are not persuasive.

.

In the remarks, the applicant has argued substantially that:

1)   The cited art does not disclose the newly added features of presently amended

claims 1, 8 and 13, at p. 8:7-17.

Examiner's response:

1)   In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show the new

limitations of the presently amended claims, it is noted that the newly added limitations

upon which applicant relies are fully addressed in the above art rejection.

Conclusion

7.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in

this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** See MPEP

§ 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37

CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Andre R. Fowlkes whose telephone number is (571)

272-3697. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:00am-

4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Tuan Q. Dam can be reached on (571)272-3695. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ARF

TUAN DAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER